DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 707 EC 301 322

AUTHOR Irwin, Sharon Hope
TITLE Increasing Enrollment of Preschool Children with Special Needs in Regular Daycare Programs through a Peer-Coaching, Systems Change Approach.
PUB DATE 24 Feb 92
NOTE 96p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Change; *Attitudes; *Day Care Centers; *Disabilities; Enrollment; *Mainstreaming; Parent Education; Peer Influence; Peer Relationship; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Special Needs Students; Staff Development; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This practicum was designed to increase enrollment of preschool children with special needs in seven regular day care centers. Corollary aims were to improve the attitudes of day care directors and staffs towards integration; to increase parental and community awareness of integration; to keep governmental day care staff aware of the program in progress; and to introduce concepts of "appreciating differences" to nonhandicapped preschool children. Seven workshops were held with directors and key staff. Other practicum activities carried out included attitude surveys of staff and directors; interviews with directors; parent awareness sessions; and consultation visits to day care centers. Three children with special needs were subsequently enrolled in regular day care programs, and staff and director attitudes toward integration became more positive. Issues of power and control are discussed. Appendices contain the attitude survey instrument for childhood professionals, data supporting practicum findings, and various administrative materials. (Approximately 80 references) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED346707

INCREASING ENROLLMENT OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN REGULAR DAYCARE PROGRAMS THROUGH A PEER-COACHING, SYSTEMS CHANGE APPROACH

by

Sharon Hope Irwin

Cluster XXXV

A Practicum 2 Report presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1992

EC 301332

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sharon Hope Irwin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum tool place as described.

Verifier: _____

John DeRoche

Professor of Sociology
Title

University College of Cape Breton, Sydney, N.S.
Address

February 9, 1992
Date

Approved:

Feb. 24, 1992
Date of Final Approval of Report

June S. Delano
June S. Delano, Ph.D., Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES iv

LIST OF FIGURES v

Chapter 1

I INTRODUCTION 1

Day Care and the Community Setting 1
Writer's Work Setting and Role 3

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM 5

Problem Description 5
Problem Documentation 6
Causative Analysis 11
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature 11

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS 16

Goals and Expectations 16
Behavioral Objectives 16
Measurements of Objectives 18
Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events 19

IV SOLUTIONS STRATEGY 20

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions 20
Description of Solution Selected 23
Report of Action Taken 24

V RESULTS, DISCUSSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 41

Results. 41
Discussion 45
Recommendations 51
Dissemination 53

page

REFERENCES 54

Appendices 62

A WAITING LIST FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS . 62

B REMEMBERED REQUESTS FOR PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS 64

C REASONS GIVEN FOR EXCLUSION 66

D CONCERNS OF STAFF REGARDING INCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS 68

E ATTITUDE SURVEY 70

F LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM DR. KATHERINE HARING & DR. MARCI HANSON 80

G LOG OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES ON MAINSTREAMING . 82

H RADIO ITEMS ON MAINSTREAMING 84

I ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN DAYCARE 86

J STATEMENT OF WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE 88

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Waiting List of Children with Special Needs for Spaces in Mainstreaming Centre and in Segregated Centre 8

2 Remembered Requests for Placement of Children with Special Needs/Inclusion in Programs 9

3 Reasons Given for Exclusion 10

Table page

4 Concerns of Staff at Regular Centres about Inclusion of Children with Special Needs. 11

5 Attitudes of Directors/Teachers toward Mainstreaming (pre-test) 26

6 Attitudes of Directors/Teachers toward Mainstreaming (pre-test/post-test) 42

7 Media Coverage of Daycare Mainstreaming 44

8 Children with Special Needs Enrolled in Regular Centres 45

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1 Problem and Goal Statement 20

2 Causes and Solutions 23

ABSTRACT

Increasing enrollment of preschool children with special needs in regular daycare programs through a peer-coaching, systems change approach. Irwin, Sharon Hope, 1992: Practicum II Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Day care/Preschool/Early Childhood Education and Coaching/ Collaboration/Consultation/ Systems-Change/Staff Development

This practicum was designed to increase enrollment of preschool children with special needs in seven regular daycare centres. When the practicum was initiated, no children with special needs were enrolled in these centres. Corollary aims were to improve the attitudes of daycare directors and staffs towards integration; to increase parental and community awareness of integration; to keep governmental daycare staff aware of the program in progress; and to introduce concepts of "appreciating differences" to non-handicapped preschool children.

Five out-of-centre and two in-centre workshops were held: two with directors-only; the others with key staff. As the actual intervention began, it quickly became apparent that issues of "power and control" were paramount, despite earlier indications that issues of programming, training, parental opinion, and concerns about children were preventing pro-active integration decisions. The directors-only workshops focused on policy-level concerns, particularly those regarding probable changes in relationships with the government, were the centres to integrate. The extremely independent directors were very cautious about surrendering their program autonomy for a permissive program that would bring them little funding, prestige, or power. Key staff, as well as line staff, were also primarily concerned about issues of "control and power." Attitude was measured by a pre/post instrument, combining elements from Hanson & Haring (1988) and Denholm (1990).

Outcomes of this practicum were very positive. The three children with special needs, who applied during the intervention, are now enrolled in regular daycare programs; staff/director attitudes toward integration have become more positive, in all cases. And although not the major focus of this intervention, parents, community, and non-handicapped children have been exposed to concepts of integration. The outcomes of this practium clearly support the idea that change within the daycare environment must start by addressing the attitudes of directors and staff, not by introducing new pedogogical elements.

****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood, I do (x) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

17 March 92 — (date)

Sharon Hope Irwin — (signature)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Day Care and the Community Setting

The daycare centres are located on a sparsely-populated island, approximately one hundred miles by forty miles in area, linked to the mainland by a causeway that was build twenty-five years ago. The island's population centre (a cluster of four towns) is approximately two hundred and fifty miles from the nearest major city. Both winter and spring driving conditions help to perpetuate an "island mentality", since the levels of snow, ice, and fog often make long-distance driving impossible.

The island has an official unemployment rate of 21%, a considerably higher unofficial one, and a total population of approximately 110,000. Local people work in coal mining, a rapidly "downsizing" industry; at fishing; at logging; at a small steel mill; and in service occupations. A small university, a community college, six small hospitals, the postal service, a mix of public schools, and local government represent the public sector. There are no factories on the island, despite on-going attempts by both the federal and provincial governments to lure industry through direct grants and tax incentives. Very few women work for either of the public corporations that run the coal and steel industries; their employment is mainly found in the public sector, in the fish packing plants, in

small retail businesses, and in service occupations. Of parents using day care, many are single women who are supported by the government in job training programs or in technical or university courses.

A strong Unemployment Insurance Act acts as an underpinning to the economic survival of the area. Ten weeks of work qualifies anyone for forty-two weeks of unemployment insurance compensation at 60% of pay. While such remuneration is low, it is still seen by the community as a safety net, and various job sharing schemes, both officially approved and officially ignored, spread work among as many people as possible.

Daycare has played an important role in the lives of the island's young families, particularly those in the "industrial area", which includes a total population of 100,000 people, and eight regular non-profit daycare centres, as well as five commercial centres, and one non-profit segregated centre for children with special needs. Of parents using public daycare, at least 70% (Day Care Services, 1990) are entitled to fee subsidies, because their total family incomes fall below the median for this province--approximately $18,000 U.S. for a family of two. Approximately 50% of families using public daycare consist of a single mother and her child(ren), and nearly half (Day Care Services, 1990) of these parents are attending vocational school, university, or other forms of employment preparation.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

For fifteen years, the writer worked as the founder/director of one of the island daycare centres. That centre became widely known for its inclusion of 20% children with special needs, and for the training, building modifications, adaptive technology, and parent participation it engendered. Periodically, that centre provided outreach services to other island centres--such as workshops, itinerant resource coordination, and support staffing when they included children with special needs; and workshops on creativity and problem solving for preschoolers. The writer has served on many local, provincial, and national boards, task forces, and committees. Her visibility within the island daycare community has been high.

Approximately two years ago, urged by the chairperson of the regional Children's Hospital 250 miles away to "quit polishing that program, and find a way to replicate it elsewhere," the writer had designed a national research and promotion proposal that was funded in January 1990 by the federal government for three years. The goal of that project is to increase the quality and quantity of daycare mainstreaming across Canada through research, information, public education/advocacy, and on-going support.

As Project Director, the writer initiated a national survey of daycare caregivers' attitudes towards mainstreaming and with respect to the theoretical model they hold (developmental or behavioral). This survey was conducted through the postal service,

with the 9-page questionnaire, a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope included. Her first practicum (Irwin, 1991), "Reducing the Social Isolation of Preschoolers with Special Needs in a Mainstream Daycare through Social Skill-Building", suggests the direction of her current work.

CHAPTER 2

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

The problem observed by the writer was that, in this area, most preschoolers with special needs did not receive mainstreaming experiences. Research (Guralnick & Bricker, 1987; Strain, 1988; Odom & McLean, 1988) strongly suggested that preschool mainstreaming is both efficacious and cost-effective. Local parental preference for mainstreaming experiences was also very clear.

Despite the fact that provincial financial support was available to non-profit island daycare centres that included children with special needs, seven of the eight "regular" centres did not include such children. The one centre that mainstreamed children with special needs consistently reported a waiting list of from ten to twenty children for its twelve spaces. Children on its waiting list lived in areas as far as forty miles away. The one segregated centre consistently reported an under-enrollment for its twelve spaces. Five of the children filling its current enrollment of ten would have been withdrawn from this program, were mainstreaming spaces available, according to their parents. Parents of children with special needs were adamant in their desire for mainstream daycare. Several drove upwards of eighty miles a day, in addition to their drives to work, to use the one mainstream daycare, even though the

segregated centre was only two miles from their workplaces. One school board fund-raised to provide a car so that a parent could access the one mainstream centre thirty miles from her home.

Although differential funding and provincial guidelines were provided in 1984 to encourage regular daycare centres to enroll children with special needs, the funding continued to be under-utilized. The popularization of the concepts of mainstreaming and of normalization, in magazines such as Homemaker's (1990) and People (1990) did not seem to influence local attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special needs in regular daycare. Moreover, the addition of a third-year diploma course in special needs by one provincial ECE training program, as well as the addition of workshops and short courses in special needs by other training institutions, alleviating the lack of training, did not lead to greater inclusion of children with special needs in regular daycare on this island.

It appeared that despite waiting lists, parent preferences, financial incentives, popular promotion of the concept, and training, children with special needs were not included in regular daycare.

Problem Documentation

Prior to 1984, it might well have been argued that most regular daycare centres did not include children with special needs because of financial restraints. However, in 1983 (Nova Scotia, 1983), the province agreed to provide "special needs differentials" on a case-by case basis, to a 1991 maximum of $27.50/day/child, in addition to parent fees or subsidized parent fees. It was expected that this decision would increase the inclusion of children with special needs;

however it did not. A letter from the Provincial daycare division (January 1991) stated that the funding for inclusion of children with special needs in regular daycare centres had been under-utilized. Unless it can be assumed that all children with special needs whose parents wanted services were receiving them, then it must be concluded that the money was under-utilized because centres chose not to access it. Provincial daycare staff informally suggested that their own administrative guidelines for this funding might well have intimidated or overwhelmed some centre directors who would otherwise have accessed the funding and included children with special needs. The writer's experience (Irwin, 1985) with an outreach mainstreaming program (1979-1984) similarly suggested that when the daycare centres were freed from the administrative details and program planning for mainstreaming, they were more receptive to mainstreaming.

Parents of children with special needs had been vocal and visible in the local media. Television interviews (Inquiry, 1988; CBC Regional Reports, 1988) with two parents of children with special needs pointed to the lack of mainstreaming opportunities in most of the island. One mother said "we went everywhere, and nobody would take Casey. One director said her staff would quit. Then we went to that centre, where they welcomed him with open arms." The other parent spoke of driving many miles from another part of the island because she believed that mainstreaming was best for her blind child. Radio talk shows and information programs also featured parents on a regular basis.

The waiting list at the one integrated centre, as compared to the one at the segregated centre, supported the contention that many parents wanted mainstreaming for their children. This situation had been quite consistent over the previous five years.

Table I

Waiting List of Children with Special Needs for Spaces in Mainstreaming Centre and in Segregated Centre

Date	#for mainstreaming centre	#for segregated centre
10/86	20	0
10/87	24	0
10/88	22	0
10/89	30	0
10/90	35	0

Note: October of each year was selected as the comparison month, because September would have seen a turn-over in enrollment of all children leaving for school, and thus October would demonstrate genuine "waiting list" when all vacancies were filled. (See Appendix "A".)

The directors of all seven non-mainstream, regular programs were surveyed. They were asked about queries regarding placement of children with special needs and about current enrollment of children with special needs. According to their responses, it appeared that: 1) calls from parents of children with special needs had been fairly frequent over the past, and 2) no children with special needs were currently enrolled.

Table 2

Remembered Requests for Placement of Children with Special Needs/Inclusion in Programs
1990

Centre #	Requests	Inclusion
1	6	0
2	3	0
3	4	0
4	3	0
5	4	0
6	2	0
7	3	0

Note: See Appendix "B".

The directors were also surveyed as to their reasons for not including children with special needs. Reasons given for exclusion were listed as: 1) no space - centre full; 2) too much hassle; 3) staff not sufficiently trained; 4) too much paperwork; 5) financial reimbursement not adequate.; 6) child wouldn't benefit from our program; 7) other kids would lose out; 8) other parents would object. and 9) other. (See Table 3).

Table 3

Reasons Given by Directors for Exclusion

Centre #	Reasons Given							
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1	x	x	--	x	x	x	--	--
2	--	--	x	--	x	--	--	x
3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	--
4	--	x	x	x	x	x	x	--
5	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	--
6	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
7	x	x	--	x	x	x	x	x

Note: See Appendix "C"

Thirty staff at the seven centres, when surveyed through a checklist, gave several reasons why they felt that children with special needs should not be included in their centre. (See Table 4.)

Table 4

Concerns of Staff at Regular Centres about Inclusion of Children with Special Needs (In Rank Order)

1. lack of training
2. concern about the other children
3. too much work already
4. concern about parent perceptions
5. concern about unrealistic expectations
6. concern over particular handicapping conditions
7. other _____

Note. Number ("N") of staff in regular daycare centres surveyed = 30. See Appendix "D". Staff were allowed to check as many items as they considered appropriate.

Causative Analysis

Through discussions with parents, directors, childcare workers at daycare centres, and provincial daycare administrators, as well as through analysis of waiting lists, data on inclusion of children with special needs, and surveys (see Tables 1-4 above), it appeared to the writer that underlying the exclusion of children with special needs from regular daycare centres were five causal factors:

1. concerns about children - nonhandicapped and handicapped
2. concerns about parents
3. concerns about staff
4. concerns about governmental support
5. concerns about community

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

An analysis of the literature confirmed the writer's supposition that concern over attitudes toward mainstreaming of preschoolers with special needs, by day care directors, daycare staff, the larger community, provincial civil servants, parents of typical children and typical children, was widespread.

Larrivee (1979) suggests that teacher attitudes toward children with special needs may well be a more powerful variable in successful mainstreaming than any administrative or curricular variable. Garvar-Pinhas and Pedhazur Schmelkin (1989) considered attitudinal differences between regular educators, special educators, and administrators, and analyze questionnaire responses through a factor analysis that yielded four subscales. Antonak (1980) proposed a "hierarchy of attitudes toward exceptionality", in considering the responses of 122 university students to 24 statements expressing attitudes toward school and community integration of 11 groups with exceptionalities. McEvoy, Nordquist, & Cunningham (1984) employed a three-way design to determine whether teachers' judgements about mentally retarded children would be related to characteristics of the children, characteristics of the teacher, and/or characteristics of an integrated free-play setting. Peck, Hayden, Wandschneider,

Peterson, & Richarz (1989) investigated sources of resistance to preschool mainstreaming, including teacher and administrator attitude. Blacher & Turnbull (1982) queried approximately 100 preschool teachers in First Chance projects, all of whom worked in either mainstreaming or reverse mainstreaming projects, regarding attitudes toward mainstreaming; they compared these findings to those from a similar survey of parents.

Substantial concern had been voiced in the local area, by staff and directors, over the effects mainstreaming might have on non-handicapped children. Esposito (1987), Bear & Proctor (1990), Handleman, Harris, Tomchek, & Kristoff (1990), and Strain (1988) all report either positive effects or neutral effects on the nonhandicapped children from their mainstreaming experience. Kohn (1990) reports on the development of altruism and empathy in typical preschoolers exposed to children with disabilities as do Smilansky & Shefatya (1990).

In numerous studies from a larger project entitled "The effects of preschool mainstreaming on parents," Turnbull & Blacher (1982), Turnbull & Winton (1983), Bailey & Winton(1987), Blacher & Turnbull (1983), Turnbull, Winton, Blacker, & Salkind (1983), Winton, Turnbull, & Blacher (1985) report on various aspects of parental attitudes toward programs for preschool children with special needs. Green & Stoneman (1989) characterize the earlier work as focusing primarily on mothers, and as not including attitudinal responses of parents of nonhandicapped children not attending mainstreaming programs. Reichart, Lynch, Anderson, Svobodny, DiCola, & Mercury (1989) add a study of parental

perspectives (of both nonhandicapped and handicapped) at the time of initial integration.

Advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming for children with special needs have been widely studied in the literature (Strain, 1988; Odom & McLean, 1988; Guralnick & Bricker, 1987). Templeman, Fredericks, & Udell (1989) report substantial social gains through mainstreaming, but suggest further research in the questions of whether the mainstreaming environment enhances cognitive development.

Concerns about administrative support, particularly from the governmental level were widespread in the frontline daycare community. Little research exists in Canada to support these concerns, but Garvar-Pinhas & Pedhazur Schmelkin (1989) note that administrators, by virtue of their leadership positions, are of particularly critical importance in the overall mainstreaming process. In daycare, the term "administrators" includes the broader category of provincial (or regional) departmental staff, since the hierarchy of the educational system is not duplicated in daycare, and thus daycare directors typically liaise directly with these civil servants.

Finally, considerations of the role and status of daycare within the broader community are considered in the literature. Daycare staff, for the most part, belong to one of the lowest paid occupations in this country (Statistics Canada, 1989). Concerned about community perceptions of their role, daycare staff, like other emerging semi-professionals seem ready to assume tasks that enhance status and community perceptions (Etzioni, 1969). If mainstreaming were perceived as a high level task, its acceptance as

an additional role for daycare workers would be enhanced. Indicators that daycare is being expected to assume a new role parallel to that now being assumed by a higher status group (i.e, teachers) would tend to enhance its acceptance.

The research is quite clear that attitudes of directors and daycare workers, parents, provincial administrators, and the community are a critical factor in successful mainstreaming of preschool children with special needs. In addition to supporting the writer's supposition that the problem is an important one, the literature suggests some causes of the problem.

Peck, Richarz, Peterson, Heyden, Mineur, & Wandschneider (1989) hypothesize that underlying the articulated concerns are issues of control. Templeman, Fredericks, & Udell (1989) suggest that role confusion and role release are major issues. Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg (1987) suggest that territoriality and control are central issues. Tait & Wolfgang (1984) suggest that underlying negative staff attitudes toward mainstreaming is a feeling of powerlessness.

Thus it appeared that the lack of mainstreaming experiences for children with special needs, in this area, resulted from negative attitudes of daycare directors and staff about their own skills, about risks to children, about parental perceptions, about administrative perceptions, and about community perceptions. However underlying the expressed attitudes of directors and teachers expected to include a new population of children - those with special needs - were a complex array of questions of power and control in their worklives which needed to be addressed.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Objectives

The following goal was projected for this practicum: that an increased number of preschool children with special needs will have mainstream daycare experiences.

Behavioral Objectives

The following six behavioral objects were projected for this practicum.

1. As a result of this practicum, directors/teachers will show more positive attitudes, on a pre/post attitude survey. (See Appendix "E".)
   a. As an end result, 4 of the 7 directors and 15 of the 30 staff will display a more positive attitude toward mainstreaming, as indicated by an increase in positive responses to at least 22 out of 45 questions on a pre/post attitude survey.
   b. The evaluation system will be an attitude survey, incorporating features of two existing survey forms.
2. As a result of this practicum, parents attending the legally-mandated parent meetings at the seven regular daycare centres will gain knowledge about mainstreaming.

a. As an end result, over half of the parents will display a 50% gain in knowledge about mainstreaming, as indicated by number of correct answers on a 10 item questionnaire.

b. The evaluation tool will be a pre/post questionnaire. (See Appendix "F".)

3. As a result of this practicum, typical children attending the seven centres will have attended five skill sessions on being buddies and understanding differences.

a. As an end result, over half of the typical children will have five skill sessions.

b. The evaluation tool will be a skill-session attendance form, compiled at each centre. (See Appendix "G".)

4. As a result of this practicum, the provincial daycare administrators will be aware of local daycare attitudes toward mainstreaming and of effective change agents.

a. As an end result, provincial administrators will receive analyses of needs assessments and attitude surveys of directors/staff in the seven regular centres.

b. The evaluation tool will be a registered mail receipt.

5. As a result of this practicum, the local newspapers and the local radio stations will increase their coverage of daycare mainstreaming.
   a. As an end result, the local newspapers and the local radio stations will increase their coverage of daycare mainstreaming by 50%, for the duration of this practicum.
   b. The evaluation tool will be a simple checklist of lines of coverage from the newspapers and minutes of airtime for the radio stations.
6. As a result of this practicum, there will be an increase in mainstreaming experiences for preschool children with special needs.
   a. As an end result, the number of preschool children with special needs receiving mainstreaming experiences will increase.

Measurement of Objectives

1. An adaptation/combination of the Hanson & Haring attitude survey (1988) and the Denholm(1988) one (See Appendices "H" and "I") was to be administered in an interview situation to the directors and staff of the seven daycare centres, on a pre-test/post-test basis. A simple non-weighted counting procedure was to be used to score the instrument.

2. Parents were to complete a pre-test/post-test one-page "test of knowledge about mainstreaming" form, prior to their meeting

and after it. A prize was to be offered, through a drawing, as an incentive for filling out the forms. (See Appendix "F".)

3. Staff at the seven daycare centres were to supply attendance sheets for all five skill sessions. (See Appendix "G".)

4. Provincial daycare officials were to indicate, by correspondence, receipt of mainstreaming training needs assessments and results of the attitude surveys.

5. Every issue of the local daily newspaper and the three major weeklies was to be scanned for articles relating to mainstreaming, for two weeks prior to the implementation of the training, and then during the training. The number of articles appearing on the topic of mainstreaming would then be compared on a weekly basis. (See Appendix "J".)

The storyboards of the local information radio shows were to be collated for evidence of the topic of mainstreaming, for two weeks prior to the implementation of the training, and then during the training. The number of radio items on the topic would then be compared on a weekly basis. (See Appendix "K".)

6. On a monthly basis, the seven centre directors were to be queried about number of special needs children included in their programs. These numbers were to be tabulated on a table, by month and by centre. (See Appendix "L".)

Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events

It was planned that the writer would keep a daily log during the implementation period, and would note all observed unexpected events.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

Although parents requested mainstream placements for their children with special needs, although the literature was positive about its benefits, and although the province had provided a "special needs differential" of $27.50/day (Day Care Services, 1991) over the $16.00/day parent fee (or subsidized parent fee), seven of the eight eligible island daycare centres still did not enroll children with special needs. Therefore, most preschool children with special needs did not receive mainstream daycare experiences. Negative attitudes of directors and staff had been identified as the primary factor that severely limited daycare mainstreaming in this region. The writer saw the problem and the goal as indicated in Figure 1.

PROBLEM	GOAL
The problem is that preschoolers with special needs do not receive mainstreaming experiences.	The goal is to increase mainstreaming experiences for preschoolers with special needs.

Figure 1. Problem and Goal Statement

The literature suggests several possible solutions to the problem.

Scallan (1987) suggests a coaching model. She notes that research reveals that teachers retain and apply less than 5% of the typical in-service education they receive, and suggests that this

percentage of actual application can be increased greatly through appropriate use of a coaching system. Olsen (1989) further elaborates on one aspect of the coaching model--the mentor teacher role - and suggests that its application will substantially increase positive change in the classroom.

Hanline (1990) suggests a consulting teacher model, in which specialists, parents, daycare teachers, and other professionals collaborate to plan, implement, and evaluate instruction conducted in the regular setting. Huefner (1988) also suggests a consulting teacher model, but cautions that without adequate preparation and support, it could easily fail to achieve its potential.

Klein and Sheehan (1987) suggest that the daycare centres focus on providing social integration opportunities for children with special needs as a complement to the early intervention services they may already be receiving. Within the context of social integration opportunites, they suggest that in-service consultation, based on the specific needs of enrolled children on a case-by-case basis be provided. Considering the high turnover rates in daycare, and the low likelihood of scheduling release time for coursework, they focus on an "as needed" approach. Leyser & Abrams (1984) also focus on in-service training as a way of changing attitudes toward mainstreaming. In an experimental study, they demonstrate positive change in attitudes through an in-service training program that combined basic knowledge about handicapped learners with the opportunity to use these newly acquired skills in their classroom while receiving feedback and support. Dileo and Meloy (1990)

outline a series of three workshops presented to teachers, which were effective in improving teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming.

Hundert & Benhke (1990) propose a collaborative teaming approach to promote effective daycare mainstreaming. They describe a collaborative strategy that included centre directors (setting supervisors), resource teachers, and regular teachers, and which led to increased involvement by regular teachers in reinforcing positive behavior of children with special needs. Mather & Weinstein (1988) describe the evolution of a partnership between preschool teachers and therapists, suggesting a collaborative process that may be productive to other mainstreaming efforts.

Peck, Hayden, Wandschneider, Peterson, & Richarz (1989) suggest a systems change approach, that recognizes the perceived loss of power by current practitioners as the prime source of negativity. Haring, Heggelund, Lynch, Pruess, Soltman & Zodrow (1989) outline a systems approach for working toward a mainstreaming model.

None of the models described in the literature could be totally replicated in this region; each presupposes the existence of at least one factor that was absent (a mainstreaming directive, funding for one staff position, or funding for substitutes for in-service time). Coaching seems to imply that an administrative decision has already been made to implement a particular change - and such was not the case here. The consulting teacher model includes a budgeted staffing component that was not present here. Extensive in-service programs generally presuppose both a budgeted staffing component and a financial/substitute arrangement for daycare staff during in-services

during working hours. Notably, Klein and Sheehan (1987) suggest an individualized in-service plan that recognizes the limited resources of daycare centres, and provides service within the centres, within the work environment, but it still requires a person to provide the in-service training. The collaborative teaming approach includes a resource teacher/consultant member of the team--a staffing component not present here. And the systems change approach requires a trained facilitator, also a staffing component not present here.

Description of Solution Selected

The writer, recognizing the lack of legislative mandate, administrative fiat, allocatible staff, and release time, designed a time/cost-effective solution combining features from all five of the change models--coaching, in-servicing, consulting, collaborative teaming, and systems change, that required only the additional services she could deliver, as indicated in Figure 2.

CAUSES	SOLUTIONS
1. Directors and staff fear a loss of control of curricula and program.	1. Train directors and key staff in a collaborative mainstreaming model.
2. Directors and staff feel that their knowledge base is inadequate.	2. Train key staff in peer coaching techniques.
3. Directors fear loss of enrolment of typical children.	3. Train directors to provide positive mainstreaming information to parents. 4. Train staff to provide skill-sessions on differences for children.
4. Directors fear loss of status in community because of mainstreaming.	5. Train directors in media presentations.

Figure 2. Causes and Solutions

Report of Action Taken

Based on a review of the literature and on response of the seven local daycare directors to survey questions about reasons for exclusion of children with disabilities, the writer had chosen a five-pronged approach, involving staff & directors, parents, typical children, provincial daycare administrators, and the general public to increase mainstreaming opportunities for preschool children with special needs. Five key activities were to be carried out by the writer during the eight-month intervention: 1) three two-hour workshops were to be held with all of the centre directors and key staff together; 2) three one-hour workshops were to be held by each centre director and her key staff person, for their staff; 3) all of the teaching staff at each centre were to present five mainstreaming activities to their preschool groups; 4) all of the staff at each centre were to participate in a parent evening, focused on mainstreaming; and 5) the general public and the provincial daycare administrators were to be informed about the activities.

For reasons to be discussed in Chapter 5, the emphasis and orientation of the intervention changed. When the intervention plan was discussed with individual directors, and when the results of the attitude survey administered to directors and all staff (at the start of the intervention) were analyzed, it was obvious that issues of "ownership and control" were vastly more important than was "skill building" with children, or "awareness" with parents of non-handicapped children and of the general community.

Therefore, it was agreed that two "directors only" workshops would be held to deal with policy issues. Three directors/key staff workshops would follow, dealing with team-building, collaboration, and peer-coaching.

Parent awareness, media presentations, and "skill building" among non-handicapped children were to be collapsed into an overview session, at one workshop. Directors did not think that either the skill building activity among the children or the awareness session for parents would make sense prior to the actual admission of children with special needs into their programs. In fact, one of the directors suggested that such activities would increase anxiety, where none currently existed. And none of the directors wanted to be involved with the media at this time, over this issue. It was agreed that the parent "awareness" workshop would be low-keyed, using the "All in Together" video (T.V. Ontario, 1989), and eliminating the pre/post questionnaires. Skill-building activities would not be obligatory.

Thus, the following major activities were carried out during the eight month intervention: 1) attitude survey of each staff member and director; and an open-ended, on-site interview with each director; 2) two directors/only workshops; 3) three two-hour workshops for directors and key staff; 4) 2 mainstreaming workshops for staff at each centre, one with writer and one without; 5) parent "awareness" sessions at mandatory parent meetings; 6) two consultation visits to each centre, to encourage "skill building sessions"; and 6) post-test of staff and director attitudes.

Attitude Surveys/Open-Ended, On-Site Director Interviews:

As noted above, initial survey questions about reasons for exclusion of children with special needs had yielded responses that suggested concerns about "other children losing out" and "negative responses among parents of non-handicapped children." The extensive pre-test Attitude Questionnaire (see Appendix E) in combination with the pre-workshop interviews with directors, strongly suggested

that the directors' primary concerns were over issues about "power and control," and thus, the workshops were redesigned to address these concerns.

Table 5

Attitudes of Directors/Teachers toward Mainstreaming

Positive Responses on Pre-Test

	Directors	Teachers
Centre #1	15	25
Centre #2	27	28
Centre #3	32	29
Centre #4	25	24
Centre #5	31	22
Centre #6	24	24
Centre #7	29	32

Note. The numbers indicate the number of positive (pro-mainstreaming) responses of each director, and the average number of positive responses of each staff member, out of a possible 59 answers. Most of the questions allow Likert-type responses, and "positive" on the pre-test means answers at either the "strongly agree" or "agree" level.

Since the document "The integration of children with special needs in registered day care centres" (Nova Scotia, 1989) had been singled out by all of the seven directors as a major source of concern;

it was agreed that a discussion of this document (commonly called "the guidelines") would be part of the initial workshop. The writer also agreed to share her own experience as director of a mainstreaming centre, at that first workshop.

Misinformation was common: one director thought that specially trained staff were required by the guidelines; another thought that the suggested practices in the guidelines were Regulations. All seven explained that the paperwork was excessive. And two directors whose centres had been part of an earlier mainstreaming initiative which had provided staff to deal with the paperwork, said that they wanted something similiar now. It was obvious to the writer that at least one workshop--the first one--had to focus on "contextual factors"--on provincial policy, funding, guidelines, rather than on "content factors" or, indeed, on any issues directly concerned with in-centre mainstreaming.

Directors/Only Workshops

All directors attended the first two-hour workshop. Topics covered included: provincial mainstreaming policy, funding, guidelines; history of provincial involvement in mainstreaming; probable directions and changes in provincial mainstreaming policy and direction. Each director talked about her own experience of including children with special needs in her centre, and after the first two somewhat stilted presentations, the discussion grew animated, frank, and opinionated. Only one director seemed unwilling to get more involved; she said that the province wanted far too much control for what it was prepared to give. She reminded the group that the province was trying to impose a great number of specific

directions in its guidelines, and she was concerned about accepting such intervention in the internal program of her centre. The other directors discussed the role of the province in internal centre matters, also feeling that these were areas that were mainly the business of the board and staff, not of government.

One director also brought up several other provincial matters that might affect daycare--in particular, mainstreaming. The province had announced, over strong objections from many parents, that it was closing the residential children's institutions that currently provided care for approximately one hundred severely/profoundly disabled children. It was intended that these children be served in community-based programs including, presumably, daycare. Did this mean that the province would expect regular daycare centres to accommodate profoundly disabled chidren? If so, the directors all concluded, much more staffing, training, equipment would be needed. The director who was concerned about provincial interference cautioned the others about "opening the door" to admissions determinations by the province, rather than by admissions committees.

It was obvious that *a*, if not *the*, primary issue for the directors was that of "power and control." Until the directors were satisfied that mainstreaming would not mean surrender ot their relative autonomy from provincial interference, they would not commit themselves to mainstreaming. The first workshop, which extended an unscheduled extra hour and one half, ended with an agreement to consider the "how" of mainstreaming at the next session, to consider what compliance with provincial standards would really entail. The writer, with her experience (as a daycare director) of maintaining a mainstreaming program under

those guidelines, seemed to be seen as an informed ally by the group, as someone else unwilling to surrender autonomy.

Prior to the second workshop, four of the directors telephoned to say that they wanted the time to be spent on "how to get started," not on what the province might do. They noted that they were already including children with special needs in their programs, and that the untapped "differential funding" available for such children would help them. They felt that the vocal director often got "carried away" on the subject of provincial interference. An agenda, geared to the originally planned topics, was agreed to.

Six directors attended the second workshop. The very vocal director sent her assistant, and was, herself, out of town. The workshop formally dealt with a discussion of "best practices in mainstreaming," a brief discussion of Individual Program Plans (IPP's), a review of provincial requirements, and a discussion on writing an acceptable description of child needs and child plan for provincial consideration. The **SpeciaLink** newsletters (SpeciaLink, 1990, 1991), several video series on special needs (Canadian Cerebral Palsy Association, 1991; T.V. Ontario, 1989; Educational Productions, 1989) and the Head Start manuals on "Mainstreaming Preschoolers" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981) were previewed. Directors discussed children on their waiting lists who seemed to fit the provincial "special needs" criteria, and brainstormed about how to put together necessary materials and plans. There was frank discussion about "power issues": how much the centre 'owed' the province; how staff could learn to feel like "equals" to the therapists; how staff could work as a team with support staff--usually current subsititutes, who would be brought in to assist with integration. A possible "special needs consultant"

position was also discussed--several directors remembered that they had been comfortable with "Arlene" and with "Roses," two people who had worked as "Outreach Coordinators" when the pilot integration program had existed (1979-1984). The one Assistant Director present also commented that she, too, had liked working with those two Coordinators, but that lots of staff were concerned about a "consultant level person" telling them what to do.

Director/Key Staff Workshops:

It had been agreed that the three director/key staff workships would focus on team-building, the collaborative process, and peer-coaching strategies. The directors were sure, after the first two directors/only workshops, that these issues were the basic ones to be resolved with their entire staffs--whereas the province/centre issues "belonged" to the directors, boards, and province.

Each of the three workshops--held at one month intervals, attracted between twelve and fourteen of the invited participants. And, in turn, the workshops explored team-building, collaborating with consultants and coordinators, and peer-coaching.

At the first workshop, a key staff person from one center agreed to act as "pioneer" and describe her experiences when her building had been redesigned to require teams of two daycare workers to work together. Prior to that time, separating walls had divided the centre into classrooms with one worker in each. After her fifteen minute narrative, the writer--as facilitator--helped the group to generate themes or problems from the history, and then from their own experience, that grew out of the need to work as a team member. Issues were as basic as "one of us is neat; the

other is sloppy," to "I am very emotionally nurturing and she is very much interested in cognitive matters." Techniques of scheduling, team meetings, facilitators, timing, trading lead roles weekly or daily or monthly, videotaping, third party observations were suggested as ways of developing the team. Vignettes from four staff, from four different centres were offered--some had found the breakthrough during a period of personal grief (when a parent died, and other staff were especially supportive); others found that off-work time together, particularly during the six hour car rides to yearly conferences, cemented team relationships.

The writer then had the group focus on how their own experiences could be helpful to the staff of their centres--what they could share when they went back. All agreed to try to get their groups to talk about good and bad teaming experiences, but to start with their own stories. They thought brainstorming techniques, for both common issues and potential strategies, would encourage participation and ownership of ideas. The directors agreed that they could provide at least minimal "meeting time," for teams to plan and schedule their classrooms.

The second director/key staff workshop followed one month later. Four centres had held parent "awareness" sessions at their provincially mandated parent meetings, and reported positive comments. They were relieved that they hadn't challenged parents with a "t.v. quiz show," as one staff called it. The other three centres would be holding parent meetings in November/December.

The agenda of the second director/key staff workshop included the following: informal reports from the centres on parent "awareness" sessions, and on first all-staff in-services; discussion of newly admitted children with special needs (two were now in the programs); discussion of

issues and problems that had arisen with these admissions, and how they had been resolved; information about "line jumping" for speech and physiotherapy appointments. Both directors had questions about policy, and it was decided to have a further directors-only session within the next several months--in fact, to have regular meetings on mainstreaming.

The third director/key staff workshop followed one month later. By that time, the provincial government had announced a two-year freeze in funding for subsidies to daycare, to be followed by only a 2% increase in subsidies for the third year, a truly devastating blow to the daycare community. Morale of directors and key staff was very low; a discussion of "who would be resigning soon" was only ended by the realization that there weren't any other jobs in our region in any event; it was feared that low performance, instead of resignations, was more likely. The writer presented the planned session on "developing change-agent skills," but focused the presentation to include more about "two steps forward; one step back," because of the obvious effects of the wage freeze that had just been announced.

Adopted from Project Copernicus (Edelman, 1991), the material on "developing change-agent skills" focused on assisting directors/key staff in keeping a focus on how the rest of the staff would feel about change, through helping them explore their own feelings when confronted with change. Unfortunately, the negativity induced by the provincial freeze--not only on wages, but on all expenditures--hung over the evening like a black cloud. People questioned why they should bother to do "extra" work; and suggested that the rest of their staffs would be even more negative than they were. However, back in their centres some people felt more positive, and telephoned to say so.

In-centre/All-Staff Workshops:

Following the two directors/only and one directors/key staff workshop, each of the seven centres was scheduled to hold two all-staff workshops--one with the writer, and one without. Two centres, both very small, felt that they there was no need for full staff workshops--since the director worked on the floor and the "key staff person" comprised the balance of the fultime staff. Thus, five centres were scheduled to hold two all-staff meetings.

In centre #2, things went very smoothly. The director reviewed the centre's experience of including children with special needs (for 2 years during the 1979-1984 outreach program), and assured the staff that she felt confident they could do it again, under the new program. She explained her previous apprehensions, and laughed as she showed them the "guidelines," saying "you know how I hate paperwork." Staff viewed the "All In Together" video, and discussed problems they remembered from the earlier mainstreaming experience. Very little negative history was remembered. On the contrary, one staff told that she had seen "Jason" recently; another said that her mother was still working at the residential children's centre, and wondered (laughingly) whether her mother might work with children with special needs at the daycare centre. Staff did ask where they were supposed to get special skills and who was going to put together the IPP's. When the director said it would be done by an outside person (a resource coordinator), they were satisfied. Two staff

remembered both "Arlene" and "Roses" and hoped the new person would be as easy to get along with.

The writer's all-staff workshop reviewed the basic principles of mainstreaming, reassuring the staff that they were not expected to do "pull-outs" or "one-to-ones" and that, indeed, such tactics weren't considered the best ways of integrating children anyhow. The writer facilitated a discussion of the regularly occurring activities of their daycare day, and everyone brainstormed about how children with various disabilities might be accommodated within that schedule. Issues of "working with consultants" and "working as a team with current staff and with support staff" were also addressed. Staff seemed positive about the prospect of including children with special needs.

The staff at centre #3 also responded positively to the two all-staff workshops. The director felt confident enough to hold the first workshop without the writer. This centre, too, had previously included children with special needs (for three years between1979-1984 through the outreach program), and current staff included several participants in that experience. In addition, this centre, as well as #2 had participated in six workshops, as well as individual observations/consultations on gifted and talented preschoolers, given by the writer five years before. The director reported enthusiasm among the staff, and invited the writer to present her workshop the following month. This workshop, too, went smoothly. The staff had viewed the video, and commented about how this seemed easier than "pull-outs;" providing the writer with the opportunity to discuss principles of integration. Team-building exercises and discussions of collaboration were animated. Apprehension over having to write IPP's and having to do "pull-outs" without extra staff were diffused.

The director of Centre #4 presented the first all-staff workshop, and reported that staff were not sure they wanted to take on the responsibilities of children with special needs. Further discussion was held about the proposed human and fiscal supports, and she explained that she had already told her staff about these too. They had found the video slightly threatening, she said, and noted only characteristics of the videoed site that highlighted things they didn't have. The writer was invited to present her workshop, and found that the staff response was extremely passive. Still, passive wasn't "no."

Centre #5 was visited, and it was obvious that only the board chairperson would be making decisions about including children with special needs. The staff seemed positive, making many comments about "the poor dears" as they watched the video. When assured that they would not be expected to either do paperwork, design programs, or attend special classes, they seemed quite willing to include children with special needs. Clearly, the board chairperson required the information provided at the directors/only sessions; however, his presence would have changed the events into much less frank and open discussions.

Finally, Centre #1 was scheduled--the centre with the director who was most concerned about governmental interference. The director did not want to present the workshop, but agreed that the writer could present two. Although the staff were animated in their responses to the workshop topics, they seemed to turn towards the director for guidance when any questions were asked, looking for cues. She interjected, many times, her own experiences in taking children with special needs into the program but "never with the government telling me what to do." The issue of how to

access the financial supports from "the government" without allowing their "interference" with her program had clearly not been satisfied.

Centres #6 and #7 were visited informally by the writer, who received permission to show the video, have several lengthy discussions about what mainstreaming might be like, and to leave reading materials about mainstreaming. As noted above, in one centre the two staff who had come to the three workshops were the entire staff; in the other, the two were the only fulltime staff.

Parent "Awareness" Sessions:

Four centres held parent awareness sessions at their mandatory parent meetings in the month following the first director/key staff workshop. Because of director/staff concern over raising anxiety levels of parents in the centres, even before children with special needs had applied, the awareness sessions involved only the showing of the video, "All In Together, " and a question-and-answer session with the writer, whose centre was known to have included children with special needs for a long time. Several parents asked about "children from the training centre;" were these profoundly disabled children going to be part of daycare? Others mentioned nieces and nephews and cousins who had various disabilities and who had been part of everything in their communities. No one publicly suggested that children with special needs shouldn't be part of daycare.

One other centre held a parent awareness sessions in November; the remaining two did not hold parent meetings during the period.

Informal Consultations/Follow-up Visits/Post-Test:

As discussed above, scheduled parent awareness sessions were made less formal, when it became clear that the major barriers to integration lay in director/staff attitudes, not in parents and children. Moreover, since there were no children with special needs actually in any of the programs, the parent/child interventions seemed premature to the directors (and, in further consideration, to the writer). Initially, the writer had felt that heightened parental awareness might spur a pro-integration attitude, and that "same and different" activity sessions might enhance staff feelings about their own competence in dealing with the issue.

Instead, the overall plan was changed to focus more fully on the concerns expressed and implied in the individual attitude surveys and in the intensive discussions.

A return visit to the director of Centre #1 was made. She agreed to try the mainstreaming plan, if a family applied to her centre. But she continued to voice misgivings about "government interference." The control issue in Centre #5 was never resolved; the board chairperson, not the director, focused, developed, and decided policy, and even small matters remained within his control.

Numerous telephone calls followed from the six centres; all directors expressed willingness to include children with special needs, *if* they were children they thought they could handle (one talked about difficult access to their second floor for a non-mobile child; another was concerned about children who had seizures). As before, informal meetings with various staff members--at the shopping centres, at the mall, on the streets--were positive about the workshops and about including children with special needs.

The re-administration of the individual attitude survey suggested that both the directors and the frontline staff of all the seven daycare centres felt more positive about including children with special needs. In all dimensions--toward types of disabilities, towards levels of disabilities, towards a developmental approach versus a behavioral approach, all of these people answered more positively.

Inclusion of Children with Special Needs:

Currently, eight months after the initiation of the intervention, three centres have accepted children with special needs--a child with cerebral palsy, a child with global developmental delays, and a child with a severe speech and language disorder and a delay in social skills. None of the other centres report admissions requests for children with special needs at this time. The consultative model of staff support has been used--with the writer coordinating assessments and records, and preparing the initial IPP's and program materials. The volunteer from the integrated program acts as the resource facilitator, and the centres pay her out-of-pocket costs. A grant proposal has been written to cover on-going costs of resource coordination and support, and has passed the preliminary hurdles with flying colours.

Upon the request of the directors, monthly mainstreaming meetings will continue, with the directors acting as resource links back to their centres--acting as sources of training materials, newsletters, special equipment as well. The directors clearly still require: control over their centre programs; a consultant to coordinate the data assembly on each potential admission, along with the required "Individualized Plan;" and a series of training sessions demystifying mainstreaming--about

Individualized Program Plans; assembling medical/psychological information, etc.

Their questions are now often child-specific, but the underlying problems continue to be lack of knowledge of the many specifics of the process, and a need to be in control of that process. Several of them did not know how to initiate the speech and language assessment process; several did not know about consultative services available in physiotherapy, psychological assessment, or occupational therapy, either on the island or at the Children's Hospital. two hundred and fifty miles away. None felt that they had the time to coordinate the mainstreaming programs in their centres--but all wanted to administer them. The writer has been able to help with each initial plan, and seconded a "volunteer" from the integrated centre to provide an additional workshop on "developing an IPP." Some directors attended themselves; others sent an interested staff person who, presumably, will be the in-centre resource person, when the centre accepts children with special needs.

Directors of centres that currently include a child with disabilities now initiate calls for materials on specific disabilities, and also for ways of involving typical children in the mainstreaming process. "What If You Couldn't...?" kits (Selective Educational Equipment, 1978) specific to the disability of a current child have been loaned; as have "Hal's Pals" dolls and materials (Anderson, 1984), and a variety of picture books on disabilities. The Head Start manuals on "Mainstreaming Children", as well as copies of the Canadian "Preschool Children with Special Needs: A Guide to Integration" (National Institute on Mental Retardation, 1978) circulate among the centres. As staff or directors ask for material or strategies, they are provided. Thematic units on "same and different," "various kinds of

families," and of "we're all the same; we're all different" have been suggested, with directors reminded that those have been used to some degree, in their centres, already.

The guiding principle of the entire intervention has been to make sure that the directors are perceived as key players in the mainstreaming process, and that the staff role is also seen as central. Materials and strategies have been provided through the directors or designated staff, and have been introduced on a child-specific basis, centre-by-centre, as children are admitted. Work *with*, as opposed to *for*, therapists has been stressed; the unique and important insights of the daycare workers have been emphasized.

Chapter 5
RESULTS, DISCUSSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Although financial support was available, and although parents were eager to see their children with special needs integrated into regular daycare centres, seven of the areas eight daycare centres did not accept them. Through a series of workshops, directed at reducing director and staff concerns over threats to their control, status, and level of internal program harmony, the writer hoped to raise the acceptance level of children with special needs into regular daycare centres.

Initially, six objectives had been proposed. During the course of the intervention, measurements of two objectives were eliminated at the strong request of directors and staff--who saw them as too obtrusive, and many of the planned activities .required changes as well.

The first objective was that directors/teachers would show more positive attitudes on a pre/post attitude survey on mainstreaming. It was anticipated that four of the seven directors, and fifteen of the thirty staff, would display a more positive attitude, as indiviated by an increase in positive responses. As indicated in Table 6, this objective was met.

Table 6

Attitudes of Directors/Teachers toward Mainstreraming

Positive Responses on Pre-Test/Post-Test

	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
	Directors	Teachers	Directors	Teachers
Centre #1	15	25	20	45
Centre #2	27	28	39	40
Centre #3	32	29	40	38
Centre #4	25	24	30	30
Centre #5	31	22	38	28
Centre #6	24	24	26	28
Centre #7	29	32	40	44

Note. The numbers indicate the number of positive (pro-mainstreaming) responses of each director, and the average number of positive responses of each staff member, out of a possible 59 answers. Most of the questions allow Likert-type responses, and "positive" means answers at either the "strongly agree" or "agree" level.

The second objective was that parents attending legally-mandated parent meetings at the seven regular daycare centres would gain knowledge about mainstreaming. Six of the seven awareness workshops were held, but the proposed measurement of parental attitude, a pre/post test, was eliminated from the practicum for two reasons: 1) the directors felt that it would raise anxiety among the parents; and 2) the writer became aware that "parent concern" had been presented as a pseudo issue;

that when queried at length, the directors acknowledged that it was not a major area of concern for them.

The third objective was that typical children attending the seven centres would have attended five skill sessions on being buddies and understanding differences. This was to be measured by attendance sheets for dated skill sessions. It was agreed that the programs already presented some thematic material on being friends, and that without any actual integration in place, the concepts were too complex for the children and somewhat confusing for staff, and thus the measurement was eliminated. Two consulation visits to each centre were made instead, encouraging rather than demanding, "skill-building sessions" for non-handicapped children. These sessions happened fairly naturally at three centres. When children with disabilities were enrolled, staff requested disability-specific materials, and received them through their directors, from the writer.

The fourth objective was that provincial daycare administrators would be aware of local attitudes towards mainstreaming and of effective change agents. This was achieved through providing analyses of needs assessments and attitude surveys to the provincial daycare office.

The fifth objective was that local newspapers and local radio stations would increase their coverage of daycare mainstreaming by 50%. As shown in Table 7 this objective was achieved.

Table 7

Media Coverage of Daycare Mainstreaming

	baseline	Month 2	Month 5	Month 6	Month 7
Radio (a.m. show)	0	3	5	4	8
Newspaper (daily)	2	13	8	7	13

Note: Radio coverage was measured in segments; newspaper coverage, in separate article. It was not possible to separate "daycare mainstreaming" from "mainstreaming" fully in the media coverage, so the figures reflect "mainstreaming," which generally refers to "daycare mainstreaming."

It should be noted, however, that reportage on mainstreaming increased for reasons other than those promoted by the local intervention program. Specifically, the closure of the residential centre for profoundly/severely handicapped children brought a lot of coverage during month #2; the watering down of daycare regulations was newsworthy in month #5; the federal announcement that "daycare" would not be dealt with during this government's mandate, the announcement of the National Strategy of Integration of Persons with Disabilities, and the freeze on provincial daycare spending also created media events.

The sixth objective was that there would be an increase in mainstreaming experiences for children with special needs, as measured by the number of preschool children with special needs in the seven regular daycare centres. As Table 8 shows, an increase was achieved.

Table 8

Children with Special Needs in the Seven Regular Daycare Centres
Total Enrolled on 15th of Month

	1st Month	4th Month	6th Month	8th Month
Centre #1	0	0	0	0
Centre #2	0	1	2	2
Centre #3	0	0	1	1
Centre #4	0	0	0	0
Centre #5	0	0	0	0
Centre #6	0	0	0	0
Centre #7	0	0	0	0

Note: Number of children with special needs enrolled at each centre, as reported by directors.

Discussion

The goal of the practicum had been that an increased number of preschool children with special needs would have mainstreaming experiences in the writer's region--within the seven "regular" daycare centres. That goal was achieved. Very early in the practicum experience, it became very clear that the "route" to that goal was somewhat different than that originally conceptualized by the writer. She--on the basis of initial surveys--had concluded that the major barriers to integration were: governmental funding policies;

governmental regulations; staff training; staff/director beliefs in the inability of their programs to assist children with special needs, while serving "typical" children; and perceptions about the attitudes of parents of typical children. On the basis of this information, she had designed a five-prong intervention that would address each of these issues.

But when analysis of the nine-page attitude questionnaire, completed by all thirty staff and seven directors, was performed, and the lengthy on-site interviews held with all directors were reviewed, the writer was convinced that several of the issues previously identified were not, in fact, important barriers to mainstreaming. Issues of "power and control" were quickly synthesized from the questionnaires and the interviews as the underlying issues, leading to changes in the intervention plan.

As Peck (in press-b) suggests in his study of 'surviving and non-surviving integrated daycare programs,' "contextual factors" play a huge role in successful mainstreaming. Peck (in press-c, p. 3) comments that:

> One hypothesis which emerges from this state of affairs is that the aspects of integrated programs which define excellence at the level of child growth and behavior change, and which have dominated the interest of researchers and program developers, may have relatively little to do with factors affecting the implementation and maintenance of substantive changes in services delivery programs.

To the contrary, he argues that "empirical studies of implementation suggest that that socio-political rather than pedagogical factors account most powerfully for outcomes of implementation efforts."

The eight-month implementation process of this practicum strongly supports Peck's contention that context themes (defined as "those which describe ongoing conditions in the communities...or agencies, and personal/professional relationships which participants identified as contributing to the success of failure of the program") are most critical to successful integration. From the first "real" activity--signed agreement to participate in specific interventions (see Appendix K), as opposed to the isolated "opinions" on a short survey--to the core of the workshops, to extended activities requested, the directors and key staff kept requesting/demanding more attention to "contextual factors" (power and control), and less to pedogogical matters. The "how-to's", they seemed to say, could be handled later--but what could we really expect, what would change in our work world, what would we have to relinquish? These were the issues that appeared time and time again during the intervention. Every time the writer would try to turn the discussions to "how-to's"--whether for parent awareness, for children's skill-building, for detail about program planning--the participants brought the discussions back to ideology, task assignment, team-building, collaboration.

Perhaps the history of this geographical region and its daycare accounts for some of the robustness of the "power and control" issues. The seven directors had been in their positions for an average of fourteen years (only one had been there for less than ten); most had, indeed, started their centres. They had often fund-raised; papered and painted; lobbied; written proposals for buildings. Very little direct support or financial assistance had been offered by the provincial government. When their centres had begun, the regulations for daycare centres had been minimal--

principally fire and health. New regulations had been added through the years, usually with little community consultation, and were often seen--especially at this long distance from the capital city--as irrelevent or even as impediments to survival.

During the year previous to this practicum, the province had implemented a formal process for daycare centres to apply for differential funding for the integration of children with special needs. The directors felt that this process was complex, rigid, cumbersome, and all had referred to it when discussing their reasons for excluding children with special needs. One director had, in fact, insisted that she would continue to include children with special needs, when she found it appropriate, but would never apply for the funding, so onerous did she find the process and conditions.

The directors continued to stress "control" issues, and as noted above, were wary of any incursions into their programs by government officials. This "context" theme, as Peck calls it, continued to colour efforts to promote mainstreaming among the very autonomous, self-directed directors. As Caruso (1991) notes, typically daycare directors/supervisors tend to be young (under forty), have had prior experience in Early Childhood--usually as line staff, and that nationally (U.S. data), 31% had nine years or more of supervisory experience. Of these seven directors, isolated from the capital city, pioneers in the establishment of their centres, six were over forty years of age, only one had prior experience as a line staff, and they averaged fourteen years in their positions. Perhaps the perspective on mainstreaming as principally a power issue is connected to their unusually long-term attachment to their positions. Another factor--level of related education--may also have played some part in the way that the directors

viewed the issue. Only one director had completed an on-campus two-year diploma in early childhood education; two others had completed the equivalency extension program to the two-year diploma; one other had a degree in education; another a degree in business. The other two had completed the minimum training requirement--an equivalency to a one-year diploma. No investigation was made regarding these possible connections.

Like the directors, most of the staff of the seven centres had worked at the same centre, in the same position, for an average of ten years each--an extremely long period of time at any job, but in particular, in daycare, generally a field with exceptionally high turnover (Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1989). Obviously, the staffs at the seven centres had worked out an adequately harmonious relationship, among themselves, with the director, with community professionals, with government. As represented by the "key staff members," they were anxious about any reassignment of occupational roles, any additional involvements, any procedures that might threaten their customary practices. Most directors had reported that staff were primarily interested in what mainstreaming would mean for them; whether they would be expected to do new things; who would teach them child-specific skills, and whether they would be required to take evening courses.

Had the research of C.A. Peck (in press, a,b,c)been available to the writer during the development of this practicum, the objectives--although not the goal--would have been different. As noted above, the objectives and activities were revised to reflect the realities of the situation; Peck's research would have permitted the writer to have better anticipated the strength of the context themes.

Additional incursions by the writer into current research-in-process in Canada suggest that only now, in 1991-92, is the field of integrated childcare reaching that state of longevity where it can be studied contextually. Several programs in Ontario (Municipality of Toronto, Durham, Peterborough) are currently evaluating their own effectiveness; several provinces (British Columbia, 1991; Alberta, 1992; Ontario, 1991) are reviewing the direction and structures of their province-wide initiatives. The government of Canada (NWG, 1991) has commissioned a "situational overview" of "innovative Canadian integrated childcare programs" in an attempt to uncover persistent variables that occur in these programs. Officials, agency directors, daycare directors (Insull, 1992; Michal, 1992; Olan-McLean, 1992; Padgen, 1992), have, in telephone queries, suggested that issues of "maintaining the vision" and of "generational change" are issues currently confronting the "pioneer programs," as these programs reach their tenth to fifteenth years and the visionaries begin to leave the sites.

Thus, it is probably not surprising that the writer initially was led to concentrate on "pedogogical" factors, as well as "contextual" factors, rather than strictly on the contextual ones.

In retrospect, however, the writer also recognizes that the "implicit assumption" to which Peck (in press-b) refers

> an implicit assumption of most research in this area has been that the success of integrated programs depends primarily on the availability of an effective educational technology--knowledge of "how to" educate children with handicaps in typical early childhood settings

informed the selection of both objectives and activities. Despite some suggestions, even at the initial survey stage (see Tables 3 and 4) that issues of "control and power" were paramount, the writer developed objectives that related to the "how to". When the directors were interviewed at length--that is, when the intervention was actuallybeing implemented--it became quite clear that they did not see the "how to's" as especially important. Although no investigation was carried out on the topic, it may be that they had checked "other children would lose out" and "other parents would object" because they were there, not because they were important. Perhaps a "rank order" on the "reasons for exclusion" instrument would have yielded the important information earlier.

Recommendations

It became very obvious during the implementation of this practicum, that issues of power and control within the daycare centres, and between directors and government, were the basic problems to be addressed if the goal of "increasing mainstreaming opportunities for preschool children with special needs" was to be realized.

The initial surveys had suggested otherwise; they had suggested that "parent attitudes" and "child skill-building" were important concerns. Only when "real life" intervened, when directors were asked to commit themselves to specific off-site workshops and in-services, did the directors explain that "parent attitudes" and "child skill-building" were not primary issues. Perhaps the geographical isolation of the region, and perhaps the "occupational investment" of staff and directors to daycare (as evidenced by average number of years in the field and in their centres) contributed to

the strength of concerns about power and control. For whenever the writer tried to address other apparent issues (pedogogical issues, primarly), the participants brought the discussion back to those of context.

Thus, the following recommendations should be considered:

1. Any initial survey of "reasons for exclusion" should require rank-ordering of "reasons." The initial surveys (see Tables 2 and 3; and Appendices C and D) did not require rank-ordering but merely checking off "reasons." This led to misleading conclusions about practicum objectives.

2. Directors must be convinced that the addition of a mainstreaming component to their centres will not cause a loss of power or control for themselves.

3. Staff must be convinced that the addition of a mainstreaming component to their centres will not cause a loss of power or control for themselves.

4. Both directors and staff must buy into the idea that mainstreaming will enhance their status and prestige, as well as benefit children with special needs--and benefit typical children.

5. Directors and staff must each have some control over the pace and direction of mainstreaming.

6. The facilitator must be willing to see any proposed solution as a "framework," not as a rigid program, and to welcome active problem-solving by participants.

7. Follow-up observations and workshop sessions must be planned periodically.

8. A mechanism must be found to provide, on an on-going basis, some of the resource consultation and support offered by the writer during

the practium period. (This problem has been successfully addressed at the practicum site.)

Dissemination

The writer was not prepared for the high level of interest that informal discussions of this practicum's process elicited. According to people involved in governmental policy development in six provinces; researchers in academic institutions; daycare directors--the issues that surfaced during the practicum seemed to validate the many of the misgivings and apprehensions they were feeling. In addition to the informal discussions, during the practicum period the writer began to discuss "contextual themes" and "internal program harmony" in mainstream daycare at workshops and noted the eagerness of agency heads and daycare directors to discuss these topics.

As of January, 1992, the writer has agreed to present the results of this practicum at one national conference, at one provincial conference, and at four topical workshops. In addition, she has agreed to send copies of the paper to several instructors in Early Childhood Education at Canadian community colleges and universities. Finally, the paper will be featured in a national Canadian publication, SpeciaLink, the Daycare Mainstreaming Network.

REFERENCES

Alberta (in process). Review of integrated day care. Edmonton, Alberta: Ministry of Social Services, Day Care Division.

Anderson, S. (1984). Hal's Pals. (A set of dolls with visible handicaps, and teachers' guides). Winter Park, Colorado: Hal's Pals.

Antonak, R.F. (1980). A hierarchy of attitudes toward exceptionality. Journal of Special Education, 14, 231-241.

Bailey, D. & Winton, P. (1987). Stability and change in parents' expectations about mainstreaming. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 7(1), 73-88.

Bear, G.G. & Proctor, W.A. (1990). Impact of a full-time integrated program on the achievement of non-handicapped and mildly handicapped children. Exceptionality, 1(4), 227-238.

Berres, M.S. & Knoblock, P. (Eds.) (1987). Program models for mainstreaming: integrating students with moderate to severe disabilities. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Publishers.

Blacher, J. & Turnbull, A. (1982). Teacher and parent perspectives on selected social aspects of preschool mainstreaming. The Exceptional Child, 29 (3), 191-199.

Blacher, J. & Turnbull, A. (1983). Are parents mainstreamed? A survey of parent interactions in the mainstreamed preschool. Education and the Training of the Mentally Retarded, February 1983, 10-16.

British Columbia (in process). Review of Special Needs Day Care Program. Victoria, British Columbia: Ministry of Social Services and Housing, Support Services Division.

C.B.C. Regional Reports. (January,1988). Casey. (Video). Sydney, Nova Scotia: Canadian Broadcasting Company.

Canadian Cerebral Palsy Association (1991). Taking Off Lids. (Video and Workshop Leader's Guide). Ottawa: Canadian Cerebral Palsy Association.

Caruso, J.J. (1991, September). Supervisors in early childhood programs: An emerging profile. Young Children, 20-25.

Day Care Services (1990). Informal communication.

Day Care Services (1991). Correspondence.

Denholm, C. (1988). British Columbia day care attitudes toward children with special needs. Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia.

Dileo, J. & Meloy, F. (1990). Project mainstream: Improving teacher attitudes. Teaching Exceptional Children, Fall 1990, 56-57.

Durham Region, Ontario (in process). Evaluation conducted for Resources for Exceptional Children. Ajax, Ontario: Resources for Exceptional Children.

Edelman, L. (1991). Developing Change-Agent Skills: Keeping a "People-Focus" During Organizational Change. Paper presented at Preconference Workshop, St. Louis, Missouri, The Council for Exceptional Children's Division for Early Childhood. Baltimore, Maryland: Project Copernicus.

Educational Productions (1989). Good Talking with You. Oregon: Educational Productions Inc.

Esposito, B.G. (1987). The effects of preschool integration on the development of non-handicapped children. Journal for the Division of Early Childhood, 12(1), 31-46.

Etzioni, A. (1969). The semi-professions and their organization. New York: The Free Press.

Garvas-Pinhas, A., & Pedhazur Schmelkin, L. (1989). Administrators' and teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Remedial and Special Education, 10(4), 38-43.

Green, A.L. & Stoneman, Z. (1989). Attitudes of mothers and fathers of non-handicapeed children. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(4), 292-304.

Guralnick, M.J. & Bricker, D. (1987). The effectiveness of early intervention for children with cognitive and general development delays. In M.J. Guralnick & F.C. Bennett (Eds.), The effectiveness of early intervention for at-risk and handicapped children (pp. 3-29). New York: Academic Press.

Handleman, J.S., Harris, S.L., Tomchek, L., Kristoff, B. (1990). The educational progress of normal peers in an integrated preschool class with autistic children: a preliminary report. Behavioral Disorders, 16(1), 52-54.

Hanline, M.F. (1990). A consulting model for providing integration opportunities for preschool children with disabilities. Journal of Early Intervention, 14(4), 360-366.

Hannah, M.E., & Pliner, S. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children: A review and syntheses. School Psychology Review, 12, 12-25.

Hanson, M., & Haring, K., (1988). Early Childhood Special Education Questionnaire. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State University.

Haring, N.G., Heggelund, M., Lynch, V., Pruess, J., Soltman, S., Zodrow, N. (1988). The DISCO Manual: A design for implementing systems change in organizations. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Head Start Bureau 1978; rev. 1981). Mainstreaming Preschoolers. A series of eight manuals. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, DHHS Publication Nos. (OHDS) 81-31110 to 81-31118.

Homemaker's Magazine (1990, May). Huber, M. Becky: A story about courage, human rights, and a national dilemma.

Huefner, D.S. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and Opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 403-414.

Hundert, J., Benhke, B. (1990). A collaborative teaming approach to the promotion of classwide social interaction in integrated preschools: Generalization across settings. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Inquiry (September, 1987). James. (Video). Halifax, Nova Scotia: Canadian Broadcasting Company.

Insull, B. (1992). Private conversation.

Irwin, S. (1985). Report on the ALLKIDS outreach program: mainstreaming preschoolers with special needs into existing regular daycare centres, using an itinerant consultant model. Unpublished manuscript.

Irwin, S. (1991). Reducing the social isolation of preschoolers with special needs in a mainstreamed daycare through social skill-building. Ft. Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 706)

Jamieson, J.D. (1984). Attitudes of educators toward the handicapped. In R.J. Jones (Ed.), Attitudes and attitude change in special education: Theory and practice (pp. 206-222). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Klein, N., & Sheehan, R. (1987). Staff development: A key issue in meeting the needs of young handicapped children in day care settings. Topics in Early Childhood Education, 7(1), 13-27.

Kohn, A. (1990). The brighter side of human nature: Altruism and empathy in everyday life. New York: Basic Books.

Larrivee, B. Factors underlying regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 374-379.

Larrivee, B., & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude. The Journal of Special Education, 13, 315-324.

Leyser, Y. & Abrams, P. (1984). Changing attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming through in-service training. The Clearing House, 57, 250-255.

Mather, J. & Weinstein, E. (1988). Teachers and therapists: Evolution of a partnership in early intervention. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 7(4), 1-9.

May, B.J. & Furst, E.J. (1977). Evaluation and revision of an inventory for measuring attitudes toward mainstreaming. Unpublished manuscript, University of Arkansas, College of Education, Fayetteville..

McEvoy, M.A., Nordquist, V.M., & Cunningham, J.L. (1984). Regular and special education teachers' judgements about mentally retarded children in an integrated setting. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 89, 167-173.

Michal, D. (1992). Private conversation.

National Institute on Mental Retardation (1978). Children with special needs in day care: a guide to integration. Ottawa: Child care information services.

Nova Scotia (1983, June). Department of Social Services. Task Force on day care. Report. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Author.

Odom,S.L., & McLean, M. (1988). White Paper: Least Restrictive Environment and Social Integration. Division of Early Childhood..

Olam-MacLean, S. (1992). Private conversation.

Olson, K. (1989). The mentor teacher role: owners' manual. Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Books for Educators.

Ontario (in process). Review of integrated day care program. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Social Services. Child Care Policy Branch.

Padgen, G. (1992). Private conversation.

Peck C.A. (in press-a). Ecological perspectives on implementation of integrated early childhood programs, Chapter 1 In Peck, C., Odom, S., & Bricker, D. (Eds)., Integrating young children with disabilities into community programs: From research to implementation. Baltimore, Maryland: Paul Brookes Publishing (in press).

Peck, C.A. (in press-b). Factors affecting the survival of early childhood mainstreaming programs: A retrospective study. An initial report on the larger study (Peck, Furman, Helmstetter, & Reed, in press). Vancouver, Washington: Washington State University, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology.

Peck, C.A. (in press-c). Integrated early childhood programs: Research on implementation of change in organizational contexts. In Peck, C., Odom, S., & Bricker, D. (Eds)., Integrating young children with disabilities into community programs: From research to implementation. Baltimore, Maryland: Paul Brookes Publishing (in press).

Peck, C.A. , Hayden, L., Wandschneider, M., Peterson, K., & Richarz, S. (1989, Fall). Development of integrated preschools: A qualitative inquiry into sources of resistance among administrators, parents, and educators. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(4), 353-363.

Peterborough Children's Services Group. (1991, January). Status report on Day Nurseries Resource Funding Program. Peterborough, Ontario: Peterborough Children's Services Group.

Reichart, Lynch, Anderson, Svobodny, DiCola, & Mercury (1989). Parental perspectives on integrated preschool opportunities for children with handicaps and children without handicaps. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(1), 6-13.

People Magazine.(1988-91).

Reynolds, M.C., Wang, M.C. & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.

Scallan, P.C., (1987, November). Teachers coaching teachers: Development from within. Child Care Information Exchange,3-6.

Selective Educatinal Equipment (1978). "What if you couldn't?." (Series of multi-media kits). Boston, Massachusetts: Boston Children's Museum.

Smilansky, S. & Shefatya, L. (1990). Facilitating play: A medium for promoting cognitive, socio-emotional and academic development in young children. Gaithersburg, MD: Psychosocial & Educational Publications.

Smith, B. J. & Rose, D. (1991). Identifying policy options for preschool mainstreaming. Pittsburgh: Allegheny-Singer Research Institute.

SpeciaLink (Vol 1 & 2). Published 3 times yearly. Sydney, Nova Scotia: SpeciaLink.

Statistics Canada (1989). Day Care in Canada. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Strain, P.S. (1988). Least restrictive environment for preschool children with handicaps: what we know, what we should be doing. Pittsburgh: Western Psychiatric Insitute and Clinic.

T.V. Ontario (1989). All in Together. Toronto: T.V. Ontario.

Tait, P.E., & Wolfgang, C. (1984). Mainstreaming a blind child. Problems perceived in a preschool day care program. Early Child Development and Care, 13, 155-167.

Templeman, T.P., Fredericks, H.D. Bud, Udell, T. (1989). Integration of children with moderate and severe handicaps into a daycare centre. Journal of Early Intervention, 13(4).

Toronto, Ontario. Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. (1992). Retrospective evaluation of childrn's services integrated programs. Toronto, Ontario: Day Care Office.

Turnbull, A. P. & Winton, P. (1983). A comparison of specialized and mainstreamed preschools from perspectives of mothers of handicapped children, Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 8, 57-71.

Turnbull, A., Winton, P., Blacher, J., & Salkind, N. (1983) Mainstreaming in the kindergarten classroom: Perspectives of parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 6, 14-20.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C, & Phillips,D (1989). Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America: Final Report--The national child care staffing study. Oakland, CA.: Child Care Employee Project.

Will, M.C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52(5), 411-416.

Winton, P.J., Turnbull, A.P., & Blacher, J. (1985). Expectations for and satisfaction with public school kindergarten: perspectives of parents of handicapped and non-handicapped children. The Journal for the Division of Early Childhood, 9(2), 116-124.

Wolfensberger, W. (1975). Normalization: the principle of normalization in human services. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

APPENDIX A
WAITING LIST OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

APPENDIX A
WAITING LIST OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Centre: _____

Date	# of children with special needs on waiting list
October 1986	
October 1987	
October 1988	
October 1989	
October 1990	

APPENDIX B
REMEMBERED REQUESTS FOR PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

APPENDIX B

REMEMBERED REQUESTS FOR PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS DURING 1990

Centre:_____

Individual requests	Labelled disability	Inclusion/Refusal
#1		
#2		
#3		
#4		
#5		
#6		
#7		
#8		

APPENDIX C

REASONS GIVEN FOR EXCLUSION

APPENDIX C

REASONS GIVEN FOR EXCLUSION

Centre: _____

Date:_____Contact Person:_____

Reasons

1. No space- centre full
2. Too much hassle
3. staff not sufficiently trained
4. Too much paperwork
5. Financial reimbursement not adequate
6. Child wouldn't benefit from program
7. Other children would lose out
8. Other _____

APPENDIX D

CONCERNS OF STAFF REGARDING INCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

APPENDIX D

CONCERNS OF STAFF REGARDING INCLUSION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Centre:_____Staff Member:_____
Please rank the following concerns in order of importance. #1 means "most important to you"; #7 means "least important to you."

Concerns	# of order in importance to YOU
1. Lack of training in work with children with special needs.	
2. Typical children will lose out.	
3. Workload is too great without the added responsibility.	
4. Parents of typical children may resent these children.	
5. Expectations of how much I could help these children are unrealistically high.	
6. I cannot handle certain handicapping conditions, such as _____ _____.	
7. Other concerns:_____ _____.	

APPENDIX E

ATTITUDE SURVEY

EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Since you are a childcare professional who works with children with special needs, we need your opinions. This is not a test and there are no right answers. But your opinions are of critical importance.

1. We all know that teaching is initiated and directed by some combination of the adult and the child involved. Please circle below a letter from A to E, indicating your opinion of the relative importance of teacher-directed instruction and child-directed instruction.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Adult initiated/directed			Child initiated/directed	
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Adult initiated/directed			Child initiated/directed	
A	B	C	D	E

2. Please indicate your opinion of the relative importance of structured time and non-structured time in the instructional environment.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Structured for specified activities			Non-structured for free play	
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Structured for specified activities			Non-structured for free play	
A	B	C	D	E

3. Please indicate your opinion of the relative importance of developmental age and chronological age in planning a curriculum for a child.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Chronological Age				Developmental Age
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Chronological Age				Developmental Age
A	B	C	D	E

4. As a professional, you work with children who are significantly at-risk and mildly developmentally delayed. Please indicate the relative importance, in your opinion, of basing curriculum on the child's interests and on the child's assessed needs.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Based on child's interests			Based on assessed needs	
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Based on child's interests			Based on assessed needs	
A	B	C	D	E

5. You also work with children with severe and profound special needs. For these children, please indicate the relative importance, in your opinion, of basing curriculum on the child's interests and on the child's assessed needs.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Based on child's interests			Based on assessed needs	
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Based on child's interests			Based on assessed needs	
A	B	C	D	E

6. Curriculum content is based on Developmental Sequences and Task Analyzed Skill Sequences. Please indicate the relative importance of these kinds of sequences.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

Developmental Sequences			Task Analyzed Skill Sequences	
A	B	C	D	E

For children 3 to 5 years old:

Developmental Sequences			Task Analyzed Skill Sequences	
A	B	C	D	E

7. Please indicate your preferred adult:child ratio for children who are significantly at-risk or mildly developmentally delayed.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

1:12	1:9	1:6	1:3	1:1

For children 3 to 5 years old:

1:12	1:9	1:6	1:3	1:1

8. For children with severe and profound special needs, please indicate your preferred adult:child ratio.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

1:12 1:9 1:6 1:3 1:1

For children 3 to 5 years old:

1:12 1:9 1:6 1:3 1:1

9. What percent of time do you feel children who are significantly at-risk or mildly developmentally delayed should spend in a regular class/group placement?

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

10. What percent of time do you feel children who have severe and profound special needs should spend in a regular class/group placement?

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

11. In some cases special education services and therapies* are provided outside the regular classroom. Considering the case of children who are significantly at-risk or mildly developmentally delayed, please indicate the number of special education services and therapy hours a week you feel should be provided outside the regular classroom.

*special education services and therapies includes one-to-one teaching assistance, planned small group training, speech therapy, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, and psychological services.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

12. Considering children with severe and profound special needs, please indicate how many hours per week of special education services and therapies you feel should be provided outside the regular classroom.

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

13. How many hours of special education services and therapies do you feel should be provided within the regular classroom for children who are significantly at-risk or mildly developmentally delayed?

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

14. How many hours of special education services and therapies do you feel should be provided within the regular classroom for children with severe and profound special needs?

For children Birth to 3 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

For children 3 to 5 years old:

0 2 4 8 12 20 or more

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

15. I think that a child, ages 3 to 5 years, with the following characteristics should be placed in a regular preschool.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a child who is hyperactive	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is incontinent (inadequate bowel control)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a child who is eneuretic (inadequate bladder control)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is deficient in self-help skills, e.g., dressing, feeding	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has mild mobility difficulties e.g., needs crutches, wears calipers	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has moderate mobility difficulties, e.g., needs wheelchair					
a. if school is reasonably accessible	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
b. if access is unsuitable	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who requires specialized and/or adapted instructional materials to progress in preacademic skills, e.g., tactile puzzles, special scissors	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has impaired language skills (not ESL)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is at times uncontrollably aggressive	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is uncontrol-able but not aggressive (does not comply with rules or attend)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is noticeably withdrawn	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has a phobic resistance to school attendance	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who requires intensive individualized instruction to progress in academic skills	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a child who requires medical monitoring by the school staff, e.g., a child with diabetes, heart problems, haemophilia, epilepsy, etc.	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has AIDS	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has tested HIV positive	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who requires assistance with artificial bowel or bladder					
a. whose parents are willing to assist	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
b. whose parents are not willing to assist	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who requires catheterisation					
a. whose parents are willing to assist	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
b. whose parents are not willing to assist	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has been assessed as mildly intellectually disabled (IQ 55-75/80)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has been assessed as moderately intellectually disabled (IQ 30-55)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who often cannot recognize situations involving danger to himself/herself	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who displays inappropriate social behaviour, e.g., masturbation, often taking another's belongings, etc.	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has a mild visual impairment (which cannot be corrected fully by wearing of spectacles, contact lenses).	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a child who has a moderate visual impairment (needs special equipment and/or services)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is blind	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has a moderate hearing loss (needs special equipment and/or services)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who is deaf	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)
a child who has a multi disabling condition, e.g., physical and intellectual disabilities.	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)	(___)

COMMENTS:

_____
_____
_____
_____

16. My own total number of years experience in Early Childhood Special Education or Early Childhood Education: _____

17. Degree: _____ Diploma: _____ in (subject) _____

18. Other credentials/certificates: _____

19. I have undertaken at least one course in special education during my preservice training Yes (_____) No (_____)

20. I have undertaken in-service or post-graduate courses in special education Yes (_____) No (_____)

Please give details _____
_____
_____
_____

21. Please circle closest description of the community where your childcare centre is located:

Rural Small Town Isolated

Urban Suburb of large city

22. Province or territory _____

23. Please indicate your primary occupational category:

1) Childcare worker or preschool teacher	(___)1
2) Integration or special needs worker	(___)2
3) Resource teacher	(___)3
4) Teacher trainer/personnel trainer	(___)4
5) Daycare director	(___)5
6) Researcher	(___)6
7) Health care professional (e.g., physician, nurse)	(___)7
8) Physical therapist/occupational therapist	(___)8
9) Speech and language specialist	(___)9
10) Social Services professional (e.g, social worker, psychologist)	(___)10
11) Other _____	(___)11

24. I have worked in my primary occupational category (#23 above) for (____) years.

25. My childcare centre is a

1) parent co-op preschool	(___)1
2) non-profit preschool	(___)2
3) private preschool	(___)3
4) other (please describe)_____	

---

26. In my childcare centre there are

1) under 20 children	(___)1
2) 20-29 children	(___)2
3) 30-39 children	(___)3
4) 40-49 children	(___)4
5) 50-80 children	(___)5
6)more than 80 children	(___)6

please specify #_____

27. Children are organized into groups of

1)less than 8	(___)1
2)9-16 children	(___)2
3)17-20 children	(___)3
4)20-25 children	(___)4
5)more than 25	(___)5

28. My age bracket is:
20-25 (___) 26-30 (___) 31-35 (___) 36-40 (___)

41-45 (___) 46-50 (___) 52-55 (___) 56-60 (___)

62-65 (___) over 65 (___)

29. I am female (___) male (___)

30. My childcare centre has or has had enrolled in the last year at least one pupil with a special need (e.g., hearing, visual impaired, developmental delay).
Yes (___) No (___) Don't Know (___)

If yes, were any special arrangements made for this child/these children?
Yes (___) No (___) Don't Know (___)

If yes, please specify _____
_____
_____
_____

32. My childcare centre has access to additional support services provided by

	Yes	No	Don't Know	
1) Advisor for children with special needs	(___)	(___)	(___)	1
2) Additional teacher or aide - part-time	(___)	(___)	(___)	2
3) Additional teaacher or aide - full time	(___)	(___)	(___)	3
4)I nfant Development Program Consultant	(___)	(___)	(___)	4
5) Physiotherapist	(___)	(___)	(___)	5
6) Occupational therapist	(___)	(___)	(___)	6
7) Speech therapist	(___)	(___)	(___)	7
8) Social worker	(___)	(___)	(___)	8
9) Audiologist	(___)	(___)	(___)	9
10) Psychologist	(___)	(___)	(___)	10
11) Paediatrician	(___)	(___)	(___)	11
12) Registered nurse or CNA	(___)	(___)	(___)	12
13) Other service (please specify)	(___)	(___)	(___)	13

APPENDIX F
LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM DR. KATHERINE HARING

San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132

School of Education
Department of Special Education
415/338-1161

March 5, 1990

Sharon Hope Irwin
Project Director
SpeciaLink
186 Prince Street
Sydney, Nova Scotia B1P 5K5

Dear Ms. Irwin;

At your request we are granting permission for you to use our "Early Childhood Special Education Questionnaire" as a survey instrument in your SpeciaLink daycare project provided that authorship credit is given. Further, we are very interested in receiving the results of your survey.

We are pleased that you find this instrument useful and look foward to hearing from you in the future. Best of luck with your project!

Yours truly,

Marci J. Hanson, Ph.D.
Professor

Kathryn Haring, Ph.D.
Research Scientist

APPENDIX 'G'

LOG OF NEWPAPER ARTICLES ON MAINSTREAMING

APPENDIX "G"
LOG OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES ON MAINSTREAMING

Newspaper:_____
Month:_____

article	date
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

APPENDIX "H"

RADIO ITEMS ON MAINSTREAMING

APPENDIX "H"
RADIO ITEMS ON MAINSTREAMING

Station:_____

Date:_____

Item	Date
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

APPENDIX "I"

ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN PROGRAM

APPENDIX "I"

ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Centre:_____

1st day of month	number	disabilities
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

APPENDIX "J"

STATEMENT OF WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE

APPENDIX "J"

STATEMENT OF WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE

I, _____, the director of _____ daycare centre hereby agree to participate in the program being offered by Sharon Hope Irwin about mainstreaming.

I understand that it will require attendance by myself and a key staff person at 3 workshops, and will also require the use of program materials with other staff, with parents, and with children.

I further understand that the mainstreaming project will supply all curriculum materials.

_____ _____

signature date